REMARKS

Claims 1-18 have been examined. New claims 19 and 20 have been added to further describe patentable aspects of the invention.

Objection to the Claims

Claims 1-18 are objected to because of informalities. The Examiner recommends amending the claims in order to comply with antecedent basis rules and to improve clarity within the claims. Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the objections in view of the self-explanatory claim amendments made herein.

Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Dutta et al. (US 6,918,066) (hereinafter Dutta). Applicants traverse this rejection.

A.   Claims 1-3

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "wherein one or more test cases to test the browser are registered with the browser test server," which the Examiner asserts is disclosed by Dutta. In particular, the Examiner asserts:

> wherein one or more test cases (WML/HTML applications in particular web sites) to test the browser are registered with the browser test server (web browser, equivalent to applicant's tester, select the desired browsers from a list of browsers located on the web test server, see, e.g., col. 8, lines 39-41)(test the WML/HTML web page on a multitude of user agents/browsers, see, e.g., col. 4, lines 18-25).

In appears that the Examiner is asserting that the one or more <u>test cases registered with the browser test server</u> reads on a list of browsers located on a server (col. 8, lines 39-41). That is, it appears the Examiner is asserting that the variety of <u>browsers</u> (i.e., list of browsers) which

are stored or registered on a server discloses the registered test cases. However, claim 1 recites that the one or more <u>test cases</u> are registered with the browser test server <u>to test the browser</u>. Thus, it is clear from claim 1 that test cases and browsers are separate features, and the registering of browsers in Dutta is not the equivalent of registering test cases as recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, Dutta discloses developing and testing WML/HTML applications in particular web sites, and more particularly, executing <u>a web site file</u> on the selected browsers (Abstract). Dutta discloses receiving and processing a WML/HTML file or URL pointing to the WML/HTML file and an emulator program which executes a web page on all the selected browsers (col. 4, lines 22-24 and 43-47). Therefore, Dutta merely discloses that a designer passes the web page through the process (i.e., inputting and evaluating) (col. 7, lines 27-29; col. 8, 25-32). Dutta, however, does not disclose that one or more test cases are <u>registered</u> with the browser test server. Therefore, claim 1 should be patentable for at least this reason.

Claims 2 and 3 should be patentable for similar reasons set forth above.

B.   Claim 5

Claim 5 should be patentable at least by virtue of its dependency.

In addition, claim 5 recites "wherein the database includes the one or more test cases and one or more sessions stored by categories classified according to browser characteristics, and each of the sessions includes the values obtained from the browser testing." The Examiner asserts:

> the database (storage device) includes one or more test cases (WML/HTML
> file or a URL pointing to a file that contains the location of the Web site, see, e.g.,

col. 8, lines 25-29) and one or more sessions stored by categories classified according to browser characteristics (an emulator program includes a database of tags, which is supported by each browser in the browser set, see, e.g., col. 4, lines 18-33), and each of the sessions includes the values obtained from the browser testing (scorecard gives the user a summary of how the web site would be displayed on the various browsers, see, e.g., col. 7, lines 50-59 and step 62 in figure 7).

It appears the Examiner is asserting that the one or more sessions stored by categories classified according to browser characteristics reads on the database of tags disclosed in Dutta. However, an emulator program which includes <u>a database of tags</u> supported by each browser is not <u>a session which is generated as a predetermined test case</u>, in accordance with claim 1. That is, the mere disclosure of a program which includes tags which are supported by a variety of browsers in Dutta does not correlate into a session which is stored by categories classified according to browser characteristics. Therefore, claim 5 should be patentable for at least this reason.

C.   Claim 8

Claim 8 should be patentable at least by virtue of its dependency upon claim 1.

In addition, claim 8 recites "wherein each of the test cases is a contents file including one or more tags or one or more script symbols corresponding to predetermined contents that will be tested as to whether the contents are normally provided through the browser." Claim 8 should be patentable for reasons similar to those presented above in conjunction with claim 1. In particular, Dutta does not disclose that <u>a contents file</u> including one or more tags or one or more script symbols corresponding to predetermined contents is registered with the browser test server.

D.   Claims 10-12

Claims 10-12 include analogous, though not necessarily coextensive features presented in claim 1, and therefore, claims 10-12 are also patentable for the reasons discussed for claim 1.

E.   Claim 15

Claim 15 should be patentable at least by virtue of its dependency upon claim 10.

In addition, claim 15 recites, *inter alia*, "registering the created session in the category of the selected version of the browser and designating a predetermined URL address to the session." However, the mere receiving or uploading of a file, as asserted by the Examiner, does not correlate into registering the created session in the category of the selected version of the browser. Dutta does not disclose this feature. Moreover, the asserted WML/HTML file in Dutta is not a session as claimed. Therefore, claim 15 should be patentable at least for this additional reason.

F.   Claim 17

Claims 17 includes analogous, though not necessarily coextensive features presented in claim 8, and therefore, claim 17 is also patentable for the reasons discussed for claim 8.

G.   Remaining claims

Applicants submit that the remaining claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependencies.

New Claims

By this Amendment, Applicants have added new claims 19 and 20 to further define the

claimed invention. Applicants respectfully submit claims 19 and 20 recite additional features

which are not taught or suggested by the prior art of record.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed

to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is

kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue

Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any

overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

Ryan F. Heavener
Registration No. 61,512

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 19, 2008

13